

**WORK FOR A WORKERS WORLD;  
JOIN THE WORKERS PARTY!**

# LABOR ACTION

JUNE 14, 1948

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

## Both Parties Unite on "Gentleman's Agreement"

# PUSH JIM CROW DRAFT THRU SENATE

## Wallace Opposes Lifting of Embargo on Arms to Israel

By JACK BRAD

NEW YORK — Last Sunday, the newspaper PM reported that Henry Wallace was opposed to lifting the arms embargo on Palestine. The reporter, John K. Weiss, described a collective interview as follows: "He (Wallace) had a little difficulty with one ardent pro-Zionist reporter, who doesn't quite follow the Wallace objection to lifting the Palestine arms embargo. Wallace explained twice he opposes all shipments of arms from any country to any other country, adding that if the British continue to aid Abdullah, the USA should immediately cut off ERP aid to Britain."

This rather startling announcement, buried in an interview, required confirmation. A check was made with John K. Weiss, the PM reporter, who fully confirmed the printed statement. Weiss also stated that Wallace had made this position clear several times previously, a check revealed that this was true.

In his letter to Stalin, Wallace had as his second point "stopping the export of weapons by any nation to any other nation." As a result of this ambiguous formulation, Wallace has been asked numerous times if this applied to Palestine. In each case, he has affirmed that it does, according to Weiss.

In Spokane, on May 24, Wallace presented his three-point program on Palestine for new pressure on the United Nations to stop stalling, an ultimatum to the oil interests to cancel their contracts, and a threat to Britain to withhold ERP. But not one word on lifting the arms embargo.

### WALLACE AND THE CP

On this matter, he is in disagreement with the Communist Party, which after years of opposing a Jewish State, and supporting Arab pogroms, now supports lifting the embargo for its own reasons. (The Stalinists for their part are attempting to fish in muddy waters. Any policy which can permit Russian intervention in the Middle East will gain their support. Ostensibly they now support the Jewish State but there is more than an inkling of

double-cross in the N. Y. Times dispatch on June 6, which reports: "in fact some limited supplies of munitions, it is believed, already have been shipped from Czechoslovakia to both sides." This is reminiscent of the Italo-Ethiopian War when Russia sold oil to Mussolini while Stalinists were howling for support of Ethiopia.) Of course, this is not the type of difference which leads to serious conflict, since both Wallace and the CP have shown an ability for infinite adaptation when opportunity requires it.

Just what is the relationship between Wallace's opinion and that of his own party? Here, we encounter

## Palestine Truce in Offing As British Shift Strategy

By ED FINDLEY

Efforts for truce in Palestine seem to be on the verge of success as these lines are written. There seems to be real hope that, for four weeks at least, the Jewish and Arab population will be given a breathing spell, that a temporary halt will be called to the fratricidal bloodshed ravaging the land.

The truce initiative belongs to the Anglo-American bloc in the UN Security Council, whose strategic and military interests in the Middle East call for an early pacification of the country.

Unsettled conditions in Palestine carry the real threat that Russia will be able to gain a toehold in this doorway to the Middle East. Two events of the last week highlight this danger: first, the demagogic but nonetheless ominous request of the Irgun Zvai Leumi for Russian military aid; second, the demand raised by Gromyko, Russian delegate to the UN, that Russian military personnel be included in the UN truce-enforcement mission.

The British Foreign Office had hoped for stabilization through quick, decisive military victories by the invading Arab forces which would lay the basis for the kind of Arab - Jewish "compromise" that would safeguard for the empire its strategic bases in the Negev region of Palestine.

### PURPOSE OF TRUCE

The failure of the Arab League states to score strategically, and the unexpected assumption of military initiative on most fronts by the Israeli armies, led to a tactical shift in British policy which brought it closer to the United States.

complexity. The New Party has had no convention, has not adopted even a tentative platform. The program of the party actually consists of Wallace's printed statements. Wallace as a political spokesman thus speaks for himself, in consultation with the Stalinists, who dominate his advisory group. It is notorious, however, that he often says contradictory things, and frequently repudiates or denies his own statements. This happened, for example, when Wallace called for the denial of the right to bear children to farmers living on sub-marginal lands.

Those who have reported Wallace's (Continued on page 4)

British imperialism, giver of military aid to the Arab camp, suddenly appeared as the pious advocate of an "impartial" truce.

What is the political purpose of the truce?

Avowedly, the UN mediator is to conduct negotiations with the Israeli provisional government and with the representatives of the Arab states for a permanent settlement and peace. On what basis? The answer to this question is hidden behind the veils of secret diplomacy.

The TOTAL elimination of Israel as a state does not at this point seem to be the immediate objective of any of the interested powers. Even the Arab dynasts which undoubtedly would wish to crush the Israeli state must, for the present, content themselves with more limited objectives. Military and diplomatic realities of Palestine are not such any longer as to enable the Anglo-Arab coalition to reach their original goal.

The Arab leaders hope now for a successful diplomatic operation by the British surgeon to AMPUTATE PARTS OF ISRAELI TERRITORY AND RESTRICT ISRAELI SOVEREIGNTY IN THE CRUCIAL MATTER OF IMMIGRATION. A truncated Israeli state with drastically reduced economic and military viability would serve the twofold purpose of: (1) saving the face of the Arab League leadership, and (2) making possible the destruction of the Israeli state, at a later and more propitious moment.

The differences that exist between the Arab plan and the British or American policies are differences in degree only. All call for concessions by the Israeli state which would reduce its ability to exist.

(Continued on page 2)

## The "New Democracy" at Work



NEWS ITEM: Stalinist Government's Single Slate Polls Over 80 Per Cent of Czechoslovakia Vote

## Rush Through Mundt Bill Hearings

The Line-Up: AFL-CIO Against, Legion and Board of Trade For

By P. HOFFMAN

The Senate hearings on the Mundt-Nixon Bill are over. Passed by the House, this infamous proposal is now in committee, and it appears likely, according to the reports of the daily press, that it will not be acted upon by this session of Congress. After all, this is an election year and the passage of a bill which will undermine civil liberties may well mean a black eye for Congress.

The hearings on the bill lasted only four days—four days of testimony on

a bill which threatens vital civil liberties! The "people's representatives" were too rushed to hear the voice of the people.

Backers of this anti-labor bill are the AMVETS, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion and the New York Board of Trade. The list suggests a roll call vote of the pillars of reaction in America. These are organizations which not only support this most monstrous curb on freedom of speech and action, but are in the forefront of those who pressed for the Taft-Hartley Law.

### CP TESTIMONY

Aside from bona fide representatives of labor, one from the AFL and one from the CIO who spoke against the bill, and spoke on behalf of the trade union movement, there were several spokesmen for the Communist (Stalinist) Party and its odd and assorted front organizations.

Both William Z. Foster and John Gates, editor of the Daily Worker, spoke for the CP. They had a difficult time proving that the Stalinist Party in America is not dominated by Moscow. Asked by the Senate Committee what their attitude toward America would be in a war between the U.S. and Russia, Foster wriggled about before replying: "Wherever we were—in the Army or anywhere else—we would cultivate to the end the war at the earliest possible moment." To this gem of evasion, he added something about "the millions whose hopes lie with every peace initiative of the Soviet Union."

America and Russia, both, are preparing for war. Nary a peace move or initiative has been seen in this war-clouded world since the "peace" that ended the senseless slaughter of World War II. Foster would have to search hard and long, not to mention in vain, for a "peace initiative" on Russia's part. Unless, of course, his distorted mind could conceive the GPU aided Stalinist coup in Czechoslovakia bid for peace. For our money it vies with Hitler's "peaceful" march into the Sudeten.

The only possibility of the Soviets going to war with the United States," John Gates declared, "would be if the United States declared war." One might ask Mr. Gates whether he exonerates that gangster, gun in hand, who shoots not first, but second. Both America and Russia have gun in hand. Whichever one shoots the first shot will be no less guilty. Both are imperialist nations, both must stand equally condemned before the world.

(Continued on page 2)

## FE Leadership Changes Its Line; Will Now Sign T-H Affidavits

By KEN HILLYER

CHICAGO—The position of the Communist Party on signing Taft-Hartley affidavits was altered this week when the United Farm Equipment Workers Union signed the affidavits.

The four officers who resigned "in protest," making it appear that they had earnestly opposed non-compliance, merely staged a hollow joke. The International Executive Board of the union decided that from a practical viewpoint, in order to save their jobs and the union, they had to comply and be allowed to compete with other unions for representation in the field.

The lessons of the defeat at the Caterpillar plant in Peoria, Ill., where the FE lost 25 per cent of its national membership, was the leading factor. The so-called referendum was a joke, given the straight control the Stalinists exert in FE, certainly enough to have defeated the referendum.

After all the educating (?) done by the CP as to how signing the affi-

## Gag Deal Bared—Let the People Vote on Draft!

The Senate kicked millions of Americans in the face, last week, in as hypocritical a display of election-time politics as 1948 will see.

Some dirty linen came out of the wash in its debate on the bill for peacetime conscription. In all its majesty, the upper house of politicians decided that it was all right for soldiers of the United States, drafted to "defend democracy," to be Jim-Crowed, segregated and insulted — if their skin was black.

They might be hailed as "heroes" in ceremonial speeches made after they were dead, but while they were alive they would be fourth-class citizens in the land of the Master Race.

This significant and enlightening episode deserves to be taken apart piece by piece, and looked at carefully.

In question, in the first place, was the program for a peacetime draft—conscription at a time when there is not only no war on in the world but when the last and greatest of civilization's slaughters is less than three years over.

All the talk of "war to end war" and "peace in our time" is as dead as a doornail in Washington, as in the other imperialist capitals of the world. The slogan now is: "In time of peace, prepare for war!" The militarization of America proceeds apace. The people are being put into the frame of mind to expect the imminent transformation of the cold war into shooting war. This is indeed one of the purposes of the draft bill.

### LABOR OPPOSES DRAFT

Like the great majority of the labor movement, we are opposed to this draft—lock, stock and barrel. (This week, for example, the CIO's legislative director reiterated labor's stand in a telegram to all House Rules Committee members. It said: "In view of the rumor circulating among certain congressmen that labor is not opposed to the present draft bill, we wish to advise you that the CIO has in no way changed its opposition to peacetime conscription.")

We don't think that this long step toward the outbreak of atomic destruction could be prettied up or made palatable with any number of amendments or qualifications. It still spells W-A-R. But some people who don't agree with us on that ought to have their eyes opened by what happened in the Senate.

By an overwhelming vote, the assembled representatives of capitalism turned down the anti-Jim-Crow amendments introduced by Senator Langer of North Dakota. The first test vote was taken on the proposal

(Continued on page 2)

## DP Bill Plays Fast and Loose with Problem

Discriminates Against Jews, Catholics; Rigged to Secure a Cheaper Labor Supply

With Europe's displaced persons, representing many religions and nationalities, desperately seeking a way out of Europe and clamoring for an opportunity to rebuild their shattered lives, the Senate this week chose to pass a bill which hurls a racialist insult at the victims of war and totalitarianism.

Cloaking its actions with the humanitarianism of providing for the admission of 200,000 DP's (who comprise a small number of those seeking entry) over the next two years, the Senate passed the Wiley-Revercomb bill which plainly discriminates against Jews and Catholics, and is so written as to favor a "cheaper labor supply" by discriminating against industrial workers.

The bill stipulates that 100,000 of the 200,000 DP emigrants must come from countries "annexed by a foreign power," that is to say, from Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Eastern Poland, which were annexed by Russia in 1939. There is nothing wrong with admitting 100,000 DP's from these countries; in fact, every

last one, regardless of what the total, ought to be permitted to enter the country. However, in the context of the bill which limits total emigration to 200,000, the design is clearly one of reducing the number of possible Jewish or Catholic entrants, for there are reported to be few of either among the Baltic DP's.

The bill stipulates that half of the 200,000 must be farmers. According to various authorities, the DP's are not farmers for the most part and the percentage of farmers among Jewish DP's is even smaller than for the whole DP population. This clause seems to have economic as well as racist implications. For, apart from its obvious limitation on Jewish immigration, it also appears to be designed to create a rural labor supply which, by implication at least, will be a low income group in comparison with urban or industrial workers.

The bill stipulates that no one shall be eligible for a visa who entered a DP camp after December 22, 1945. At that date there were only 10,000 Jewish DP's in camps, the bulk

of the Jewish DP population moving into the occupied zones of Central Europe after that date.

In general, the bill makes a mockery of the needs of the DP's and, essentially, continues the abhorrent limitations on immigration which have been on the books since 1924. There is no excuse whatsoever for any limitation on immigration. The right of asylum or immigration is fundamental democratic procedure. Even the proposed admission of 400,000 DP's is hardly adequate to the need. There is no way of meeting the problem properly except by lowering all barriers and ending the disgraceful quota system.

(As an aside to which we may return at some other time, the performance of the liberals on this issue leaves much to be desired. Thus, Max Lerner in the newspaper PM did a good job in ripping the bill apart, but in the process went in for a bit of discrimination of his own. Lerner, for example, hit the provision of the bill which favors "all persons of German ethnic origin" and went beyond

a proper blast at the ethnic qualification which is reminiscent of Hitler's categories to what reads like an objection to admitting Germans. So, too, Lerner's indignation over the favoring of the Baltics was suspicious, for his objection was not simply that other DP's were injured, but was so framed as to imply that the Baltics should either not be admitted or admitted only in small numbers.)

The Wiley-Revercomb bill now goes before the House. Another bill, however, is also before the House, the Feller bill. While limited in its provisions, it is nevertheless infinitely better than the Senate-passed bill. The DP problem is no small matter. It is a ghastly blot on the world spilled by the capitalist and Stalinist tyrants, with their wars, their totalitarian suppression of peoples and so forth. If the Feller bill is not all that is required, it is at least better than the Senate bill. It is to be hoped that the House will be pressured into substituting the Feller bill for the Wiley-Revercomb concoction.

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

# Stalinists Bar Vote at NMU Meeting

By N. GADEN  
 NEW YORK, June 8—A high point in Stalinist disruption was reached at Monday night's meeting of the New York branch of the National Maritime Union. The "hacks," as the Communist Party contingent is called in the union, sought to prevent the membership from voting its approval of the agreement that the union's negotiating committee had obtained from the tanker operators.

The meeting marked a fever high in the already "hot" NMU situation. In the current general union elections, the membership, thoroughly disgusted by years of CP misleadership, have been voting overwhelmingly to oust

the Stalinist incumbents from office, and install the "Rank-and-File" caucus slate, headed by president Joseph Curran. The "hacks," since they cannot rule the union, are now seeking to ruin it, hoping to disorganize the union as thoroughly as possible before the Rank-and-File take office.

As part of this strategy they are now seeking to force the union into a strike action, at a time when it is internally divided, in the face of a united front of shipowners and government agencies, armed with the weapon of injunction.

**STALINISTS SWITCH LINE**

During the past six months, the Stalinists have carried on an hysterical campaign for the hiring hall,

seeking to convince the membership that Curran and the rest of the Rank-and-File were preparing to sell it out to the shipowners, and stating that it was practically the only issue at stake. McCarthy, one of the important Stalinist leaders, stated, in the negotiations with the tanker operators, that the only important question was the hiring hall, and to hell with the other issues.

Curran and the Rank-and-File held that the hiring hall was not negotiable, and the negotiating committee was able to obtain from the operators an agreement which maintained the hiring hall intact, with a five dollar monthly increase and some other minor concessions. The blame for the meagerness of the gains must be laid at the doors of the Stalinists, who by their internal disruption weakened the bargaining power of the union, and by their panicking of the membership on the hiring hall issue, disoriented and weakened the position of the negotiating committee.

While the membership of the NMU realizes that the new tanker agreement gives them only minute gains, they feel that they must accept it, because of the difficulty of waging a strike while the Stalinists still hold the reins of power in the union. It is generally felt that the Stalinists must be removed before the union can settle down to the serious business of improving seamen's conditions.

It is realized by the majority of the rank-and-file that the unsatisfactory tanker agreement represents a danger to the union, that the conservative element within the union will attempt to utilize it as a pattern for future contracts, and that only the vigilance of the membership over both the Stalinists and the conservative element will make it possible to have more satisfactory agreements in the future.

# Jim Crow Draft —

(Continued from page 1)

to outlaw racial segregation in general in the armed forces, in the matter of assignment to military units (regardless of size) and barracks.

As the New York Times noted, "the Senate responded without noticeable protest to calls to apply a gag to its debate. It went even farther than submitting to the closure rule. Three times it approved motions to shelve the pending question, which stopped debate instantaneously. Debate under closure (adopted only a few times in a generation) can persist for a few days."

The issue was considered important enough to make it one of the "few times in a generation." Only seven senators voted against Jim Crow—both of the capitalist parties went down the line almost solidly.

of racial democracy ever to come out of a high place in the government. On paper it called not only for the elimination of racial discrimination and oppression in the armed forces but in almost all walks of life.

**TRUMAN'S OWN PARTY IS SHOWING THAT IT DOES NOT CONSIDER IT IS WORTH THE PAPER IT IS WRITTEN ON.**

And Truman himself? Maybe this is a case of a senatorial rank-and-file revolt against their nominal chief? Nobody can possibly believe that anyway, but as it happens, it is unnecessary to speculate.

The same day that the papers reported the Senate's action on the Langer amendments, the New York Post, in an article by James Wechsler, revealed that the "gentleman's agreement" stemmed from no other source than the presidential propheet of the paper anti-Jim-Crow program!

However, as soon as the negotiating committee returned with the proposals, the Stalinists changed their tack. They now said that the hiring hall was not the main issue, that the gains were not sufficient, and that the union must strike. They accompanied this switch in line with a stream of slander and vituperation directed against the Rank-and-File caucus. It was in this atmosphere that the New York membership gathered at Manhattan Center on Monday night to accept or reject the agreement.

**SEEK TO PREVENT VOTE**

The hacks, knowing they were vastly outnumbered, determined to prevent the issue from coming to a vote. Their catcalls and boos prevented speakers from being heard. They threw a barrage of pennies at president Curran on the stage, and did everything possible to disrupt the orderly procedure of the meeting. Since it was impossible in this atmosphere to get any business accomplished, president Curran was forced to adjourn the meeting without a vote. However, since meetings in the other ports have already accepted the agreement, it will go into effect.

## BACK-DOOR AGREEMENT

Among the other amendments defeated were those to bar race discrimination in interstate traveling of troops; to apply the oft-proposed anti-lynching bill to troops; to stop draftee training in states with segregation laws; to give all inductees equal rights in hotels, restaurants and places of amusement; to buy military supplies and services only from firms practicing a fair-employment policy.

Only one of the Langer amendments was carried: suspension of the infamous poll tax, as it concerned prospective voters in the armed services, for a two-to-five-year duration. It seems that even the Southern Democratic white-supremacy maniacs "raised no great fuss" over this, as the Times says. It had been done in 1944, too. But the reason why even this amendment was carried, and the circumstances under which it was carried, tell a story.

"President Truman has rejected pleas for prompt executive action to curb racial discrimination in government agencies and in the armed services, it was learned today. [because] such moves would intensify the danger of a wide-open row at the Democratic convention.

"Within recent days, it is understood, they have informed advocates of these steps that the explosive subject must be postponed 'until after the convention.' A top-ranking CIO official who has been pressing for administration action told this newspaper today:

"We don't expect any action now. McGrath [chairman of Democratic National Committee] has apparently decided the only way he can hold the party together is to forget about the civil-rights program at least until he gets Truman nominated again."

"Thus, although Mr. Truman has once again embraced the civil-rights fight in orations on his current Western trip, it appeared certain he would face the convention with a blank record of Executive achievement. This would just about match the legislative performance of the GOP-led Congress on the civil-rights front, unless major reversals occur."

The settlement with the tanker operators places the union in a better position to deal with the AMMI, the representative of the passenger and dry-cargo outfits. So far, these ship-owners have remained obdurate in the face of union demands in regard to the contract which expires June 15. It now seems likely that they will be forced to settle on the pattern established by the agreement with the tanker operators.

**ASKS CONVENTION PLAN**

The president of the local, Charles Beckman, spoke next, asserting that while he agreed with the arguments of the two reporters, he wasn't going to advise anyone to vote for or against the agreement, that it was up to the workers to vote as they please. This was the advice of one who criticizes the international

In the first place, it revealed that this disgraceful haste to run the steamroller over the civil-liberties program was THE RESULT OF A SECRET BACK-DOOR AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS, bipartisanly in cahoots to rush through the Jim-Crow draft. This unsavory fact came out by accident, as it were, and right on the floor of the chamber.

Taft, the Republican reactionary, it seems, decided that it was necessary to inject some Republican success into a conceded almost blank performance as to civil rights during the current session of Congress (this is the New York Times' interpretation) and came out for the anti-poll-tax rider.

**DEMOCRATIC WAY**

This puts the Democrats in a perfect position.

To the millions of oppressed minority groups and liberals, they say: Vote for us—look at the pretty civil-rights program we have on paper!

And to the Southern advocates of lynch democracy they say: Vote for us—look how beautifully we KEPT this pretty civil-rights program on paper!

The indecent haste with which the anti-Jim-Crow program was steamrollered is a token of how much Truman's paper speeches mean. It is reported that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill is going to be allowed to come up for a vote in the House, but so far the draft has had the inside track. First things come first, for the capitalist parties.

The Mundt-Nixon Bill, which uses the Stalinists as a scapegoat, is in reality aimed at all political opposition. It seeks the suppression of any group which does not conform to the pattern so neatly cut by Wall Street. Today it is the CP, tomorrow a tenants' organization and the next day a militant trade union.

The bill is not law yet, and we must keep it from every being made law. The "people's representatives" in the Senate must hear the people's will. We must demand that hearings be reopened on the Mundt-Nixon Bill. Every trade union, every liberal and labor organization must raise its voice in protest. There is still time to fight. The Mundt-Nixon Bill is an attack on the labor movement. It is the job of the labor movement to counter-attack.

THE DEMOCRATIC WHIP, LUCAS OF ILLINOIS, THEREUPON ROSE IN RIGHTEOUS WRATH TO ACCUSE THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP OF VIOLATING THE "GENTLEMAN'S AGREEMENT" WHEREBY THE WHOLE SERIES OF AMENDMENTS WERE TO HAVE BEEN KNOCKED OUT IN JOINT "REPUBLICAN" ACTION.

He was burning mad and sore. All his gentlemanly instincts for cordior agreements were outraged. Here he had entered "honestly" into a plot to gag the august body of free and independent senators and was "honestly" living up to it (as did all but two of his and Truman's party) —and couldn't the Republicans be "gentlemen" too?

AND EVEN THIS ONE AMENDMENT WHICH PASSED — THE ANTI-POLL-TAX RIDER — PASSED OVER THE VOTES OF EVERY DEMOCRATIC SENATOR EXCEPT THREE! (The solid Republican vote for this proposal to give servicemen only the same right they had four years ago was no mystery to any of the correspondents: election-year politics—making the record.)

Or maybe the big brains in Congress figure that with hundreds of thousands of draftees in the barracks, the housing situation will be automatically solved, as thousands of homes are left vacant. Homeless veterans of the last war can start watching the announcements of draft lists again, and we shouldn't forget that public housing nowadays is being denounced as a program for "socialized" housing; no doubt they prefer to save our youth from the corrupting effects of living in "socialized" housing by putting them in collectivized barracks.

The steamroller and gage tactics in the Senate bear a moral. We submit that the only democratic way to decide on the draft is to put the issue to the people. It's not the senators and representatives who will go to boot camp. The only democratic way is to debate the issue in the open, and LET THE PEOPLE VOTE ON IT!

But Mundt-Nixon are using this to launch a broadside attack on the labor, liberal and socialist movements. THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT CANNOT ALLOW THAT ATTACK TO BE SUCCESSFUL. With all of its might, it must fight back.

There is a section of the trade union movement that has learned how to fight the Stalinists. The UAW has fought them by showing them up for what they are, a reactionary, totalitarian movement which acts solely in the interests of Stalin. They have proved their case to the hilt and as a result the CP lost substantially in that union. This is how the Stalinists must be fought.

**TRUMAN'S PROGRAM**

To get the full flavor of this little drama, we must remember that the leader of this same Democratic Party, only a short while ago, came out with a fanfare-trumpeted program for civil liberties and an end to racial discrimination, documented in the report of the President's Civil-Liberties Committee and in Truman's civil-liberties program.

On paper this program shines like a star—without doubt the best series of proposals for the introduction

This is a simple democratic demand. The people are involved, and in no small way, on no small issue. Let the people decide! Let the people challenge the warmakers to give them a voice!

LET THE PEOPLE VOTE ON THE DRAFT!

**NEW YORK MEETING**

**REPORT ON EUROPE**

Just returned from an extensive visit to Europe

**MAX SHACHTMAN**  
 National Chairman of the Workers Party, will speak on:

**Europe in the Shadow of World War III**

An Eye-Witness Report

# Local 45 Ratifies G.M. Settlement

By JOE HAUSER  
 CLEVELAND, June 5—At a special membership meeting held today, Fisher Body Local 45, UAW-CIO, voted by a large majority to accept the General Motors settlement as negotiated by the United Auto Workers and the corporation. This was accomplished despite the Stalinists' plea for rejection of the settlement.

The reports on the GM contract, which calls for an 11-cent an hour wage increase now plus a modified escalator clause, were made by Leo Fenster and John DeVito. They pointed out the just demands of the GM workers for pension, guaranteed 40-hour work week, union shop, stewards system, etc., and since none of these union demands were met, they condemned the settlement. They piled abuse on the heads of the international leadership in their usual factional manner, and asked that since there was no doubt that the majority of the locals would favor the contract, that Local 45 "and other militant locals" vote against the contract as a protest against the Reutherite leadership.

leadership roundly for not inspiring the militancy in the membership, for not really "leading."

Another of the officers of the local, Bert Foster, spoke for acceptance of the contract, describing labor's difficult position today, and asserting that the workers in the shop do favor this settlement under present conditions. The only other speaker, Max Schoenfeld, a steward, spoke for the unfavorable situation faced by the unions. He pointed out that General Motors gave nothing by itself; it conceded what it did because a strike threatened, and thus made the first big break in the "no wage increase" front of the big corporations.

This speaker also protested the two-year contract as a very large price to pay, as it prevents the union from pushing for many just and necessary demands for such a long period. He ended up by asking that the UAW plan at the next convention to terminate its contracts at the same time, so as to bargain on an industry-wide basis, and further, that the CIO and AFL coordinate their strategy so as to confront the manufacturers with a solid and unified front of labor.

A standing vote was taken on the question of acceptance or rejection, and a large majority of the members present voted for acceptance. The vote was not actually counted, however. A motion was rushed through then for a committee to draft a telegram to the international, including criticism of the agreement. The criticism was not made specific and, as the local leadership will write it up in its own manner, there is a good chance that no one will realize that this leadership did receive a defeat from the membership for its factional handling of the contract.

There is a lesson to be learned. Local 45 has been a spearhead for the Stalinists in the UAW, mainly because no one in the local gets on the floor and fights day in and day out on the vital questions that come up. A very militant membership might have voted against this agreement as being inadequate, and they would have been right. This membership was asked to vote "no" as a factional move, and when presented with a true picture by a few speakers, they voted to accept the contract as a not-too-bad compromise under present unfavorable circumstances.

Hotel Diplomat  
 108 West 43rd Street

Friday, June 25, 8:30 P. M.  
 Special Admission for SYL: 30 Cents

Admission: 60 Cents

Auspices: Local New York WP

Friday, June 25, 8:30 P. M.  
 Special Admission for SYL: 30 Cents

Admission: 60 Cents

Auspices: Local New York WP

Friday, June 25, 8:30 P. M.  
 Special Admission for SYL: 30 Cents

Admission: 60 Cents

Auspices: Local New York WP

# Palestine Truce —

(Continued from page 1)

The efforts of the Israeli state to defend its integrity will have, at best, a weak and vacillating ally in the U.S. and a treacherous opponent in Britain. Two-faced Russia—which permits its satellites to imitate the "merchants of death" and sell arms to both sides—will in all probability give diplomatic support to the Israeli state in the UN deliberations. Few of the Jewish masses will be taken in by the maneuvering of this shifty imperialist power which only yesterday supported and praised the pogromist campaigns of feudal Arab overlords.

The UN truce in Palestine means that the Anglo-Arab war of aggression against Israel will be continued by other means, on the diplomatic battlefield. This is a field on which the Munichites have developed great talent in selling out peoples.

On the labor movement throughout the world, most particularly on the working class of Britain and the United States, devolves the duty to defend the right of the Jews to full self-determination in Israel.

permitted its satellites to imitate the "merchants of death" and sell arms to both sides—will in all probability give diplomatic support to the Israeli state in the UN deliberations. Few of the Jewish masses will be taken in by the maneuvering of this shifty imperialist power which only yesterday supported and praised the pogromist campaigns of feudal Arab overlords.

The UN truce in Palestine means that the Anglo-Arab war of aggression against Israel will be continued by other means, on the diplomatic battlefield. This is a field on which the Munichites have developed great talent in selling out peoples.

On the labor movement throughout the world, most particularly on the working class of Britain and the United States, devolves the duty to defend the right of the Jews to full self-determination in Israel.

# Max Shachtman Will Report on Europe Situation

NEW YORK—Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Workers Party, will shortly return from a several months' visit on the European continent and England.

During his stay, Comrade Shachtman had an opportunity to speak with many of the active socialist leaders. He was in a position to observe the regroupment in France known as the Revolutionary Democratic Rally (RDR) which is one of the most significant developments since the war in the Socialist Movement. This turn toward an anti-Stalinist as well as anti-capitalist political program for large number of workers and intellectuals is of especially great interest.

Shachtman saw England in the third year of the Labor Party regime, and discussed the effects of the Marshall Plan on the labor movement with numerous European observers.

The Workers Party, Local New York, will hold a meeting at the Hotel Diplomat, 108 West 43rd Street, on Friday, June 25, to welcome Comrade Shachtman and to hear his report on Europe. This will be the only meeting in this area at which Shachtman will speak on his observations of Europe caught in the vise between Washington and Moscow.

Shachtman is known as one of the keenest observers of events, and has been active in the socialist and labor movement for over 25 years. He is on the editorial board of The New Internationalist, the leading Marxist revolutionary journal in the United States. He has made important theoretical contributions on the nature of Stalinism and on the structure of the Russian state. A life-long revolutionist, he was associated with Leon Trotsky, being for many years his American translator. A consistent activist in the fight against war and capitalism, he was one of the founders of the Workers Party.

## BAIL REDUCED \$58,000 IN FARM LABOR STRIKE

BAKERSFIELD, Cal. (WDL)—Bail for four striking Di Giorgio farm workers arrested on malicious mischief charges was reduced from \$15,000 to \$500 each following a habeas corpus petition filed here by National Farm Labor Union attorneys. The Workers Defense League had joined the union to protesting to the court the excessive bail fixed on the misdemeanor charge. The reduced bail was promptly posted by the union.

The 1,100 striking farm workers passed the hundredth day of the strike against the vast Di Giorgio food empire with increasing support from the small farmers in the area. \$1,000 in cash and five acres of land have been given for the erection of a union headquarters.

**Subscribers — Attention!**

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

1 2 - 2 4

If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

**RENEW NOW**

**EXTEND YOUR SUB**

**ANNUAL PICNIC**

**IN PHILADELPHIA:**

**Burkholme Park**

**SUNDAY, JUNE 22**

**11:30 a.m.**

Main Entrance  
 Central & Colman Ave.

**Games, Sports, Refreshments**

All Invited

Auspices: Philadelphia WP

**DEBATE! DEBATE! DEBATE!**

**"Is Britain Going Socialist?"**

**"YES"**  
 Jesse Cavileer  
 Executive Secretary  
 Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID)

**"NO"**  
 Julius Falk  
 National Secretary  
 Socialist Youth League

Date: FRIDAY, JUNE 18, AT 8:00 P. M.

Place: 114 WEST 14TH STREET, New York City  
 (between 6th and 7th Aves.)

Auspices: Socialist Youth League Admission: twenty-five cents

**HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE**

**LABOR ACTION**

A Paper in the Interest of Socialism

4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:  NEW  RENEWAL

Six months (26 issues) at 50 cents.

One year (52 issues) at \$1.00.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ (please print)

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_ APT. \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_ ZONE \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_

Bill me  Payment enclosed (Stamps, currency or Postal Note)

Issues in South Africa's General Election

A "Free" Election — For Whites Only!

By R. STONE.

JOHANNESBURG, South Africa — The South African general election is a unique event in world politics, outside the openly totalitarian countries. This election, democratic only for the white minority, delegated to this minority the right to decide in totalitarian fashion the fate of the black majority of South Africa's population.

Deposed



In South Africa, democracy and totalitarianism constitute the two heads of the white ruling class. This election was openly fought on what is known in South Africa as the "color question," i.e., the most effective, the most methodical and organized way of keeping the non-white mass in its servile place.

Although both white camps — United Party (Smuts) and Nationalists (Malan) — are agreed and united in their ruthless determination to maintain the economic, social and political slavery of the non-white toilers, there are minor cleavages in their policies toward this key question.

SOCIAL BASES OF PARTIES

These differences reflect the differing social bases on which these two political blocs support themselves. The United Party is the political receptacle of the predominant economic interests of British finance capital and the Rand mining lords, the local industrialists and the most prosperous farmers, and through the white labor party, of the aristocratic white workers. The Nationalist Party gives political voice to the wounded memories of the Boers who have not yet forgotten the 1903 war, the rising Afrikaaner intelligentsia and businessmen, the poor whites in town and country. They gained the support, this time, paradoxically enough, of the most Tory group of British imperialists, led by one Colonel Stallard, a former minister of mines, and they formed an alliance with the Afrikaaner Party (which has the support of the fascist Ossewa-Brandwag organization).

Below the outward appearance of economic boom and untroubled political stability which was Smuts' pride, there exist subterranean layers of nervousness, apprehension and alarm in the European ranks which the United Party was not able to dispel.

The small but definitive victory of the Nationalist combination (79-74 seats) articulates a crisis mood in the country, particularly in the rural areas, which has now come to the surface. Stemming from some of the most economically insecure and consequently the most politically jittery strata, this precarious electoral victory vociferates their search for more trenchant defenses against the non-white slaves' foes.

MAIN ISSUES IN THE ELECTION

Cutting across all other issues—rising cost of living, acute housing shortage—was the color question. It superimposed itself onto every plank of the election platforms of both parties. The main issues were broken down along the following concrete lines: the "menace of Communism" and the nationalist interpretation of "Apartheid" (segregation).

The "Communist menace" is the shibboleth used by the white ruling class to express their fear and uneasiness of both the expansionism of the new Russian imperialism abroad and the danger that is inherent in the yet unexploded non-white mass at home.

Smuts stole the opposition's thunder by deftly and pompously assuming the toga of an international elder warrior-statesman warning against the invading forces of Russian police-state "Communism." In his home country he was not in any way disturbed about the dangers of communism. His own smoothly running and ruthless police regime, curbing and harassing the non-white masses, was adequate to cope with any opposition movement that might develop.

Malan, on the contrary, concentrated his demagogic fire on the menace of communism at home, and called for a more ferocious use of the segregation sjambok which Smuts had helped to fashion. On the farms, on the mines and in the African reserves, the policies of British imperialism and of the Nationalists coalesce in their support of the migratory labor system and the slave-like conditions for non-whites which prevail.

Their differences in approach and estimation can be most graphically traced on the issue of segregation in the towns. Smuts, more astute though not by any means less reactionary or brutal, recognized that the industrialization of South Africa, which in the war and post-war period has been developing apace, was completely dependent on the labor of the African. He was prepared, consequently, to accept the already accomplished fact of their more or less permanent presence in the towns on the basis of segregation.

POPULATION TRENDS PROVOKE OFFENSIVE

Smuts' policy of segregation put the African into appalling slum ghettos or locations, fenced in from the outside white areas, strictly supervised and police-controlled. Africans in industry have no trade-union rights, no right to strike, and no political or democratic safeguards. This policy of Smuts is the deadline for the existence and functioning of industry.

Malan, on the other hand, giving expression to the more backward hidebound and conservative section of the backward and of the poor whites in the cities, saw the increasing influx of Africans into the towns as (a) draining away the farmers' labor supply, (b) creating potentially incendiary

black fortresses in the towns. Confronted by the demands of industry and the urge of the Africans to escape from the hopelessness of the reserves and the brutalities of the farms, the Nationalists' political blood pressure mounts like mercury in the tropical sun.

They look with the gravest concern at the following comparative population figures of Africans in the towns:

Year	No. of Africans in Urban Areas
1911	508,142
1921	587,000
1936	1,142,622
1946	2,067,370

They therefore propose, in the words of Mr. Strydom, M. P. (Nationalist leader for the province of Transvaal) that "... the native must only be allowed to a European area as a temporary worker. His wife and children must remain behind. . . . If, however, they are given the opportunity of developing in the European areas they cannot be suppressed and a blood bath must follow. . . ." (Forum, July 19, 1947, p. 15.)

Smuts also recognized the explosive potentialities of the urban African situation. But unlike his Nationalist opponents, he does not think that they cannot be suppressed, or that more stringent measures than those already in force need be taken to maintain the status quo.

The Nationalists consider this Smuts setup as —dangerous liberalism! To counteract this liberalism and to quell the concentration of African workers in the towns, they propose to tighten and bind together the countless draconic laws already firmly regulating African urbanization.

How far the aid of more policemen and the sanction of their Calvinistic god can make more inflexible the already foolproof setup existing, remains to be seen. For even the Nationalists will be forced to recognize that judicial and sanctified laws are never stronger than the elemental material and economic pressures to which they must conform. But the Nationalists will attempt to force back some of the African labor, at present streaming to the towns, and give the white farmers more black slaves.

(Continued next week)

What a Workers' Government Means: Real Democracy for the First Time

By GORDON HASKELL

My friend, Jack, says to me one day: "The Workers Party has made a very good analysis of what is wrong with the capitalist system and how the government is nothing but a tool of the fat boys to keep the workers down."

"But what I want to know," he says, "is exactly what kind of a government setup do you advocate which wouldn't be full of graft and corruption and politicians that is feathering their nest and keeping some clique in power on the backs of the people?"

"Well," I says, "we advocate a workers' government."

"I read LABOR ACTION every week," says Jack, "so you don't have to tell me that. But even if you elect workers to Congress and have a president who used to be a longshoreman, what is to prevent them from selling out to the capitalists or some gang like Stalin's bureaucrats?"

"It takes two men to make a corrupt politician," I says. "One man who has the money or the power to buy him by cash or favors, and the politician himself who can sell out and still keep his position because the voters who elect him have no control over him once he is in office."

"So the only way to make any government setup really serve the workers is first of all to eliminate the capitalists whose control over industry and trade gives them the money and power to control the government; and secondly to organize things in such a way that the common people have constant control over their representatives and can remove them anytime they don't like what they are doing."

"Well," says Jack, "we have the right to impeach politicians and in California, at least, to recall them. But just try and get one of them out. If they are smart they get their payoff legally. And if they aren't that smart, it still takes so much dough to recall one of them that we don't have a chance."

A DIFFERENT MACHINERY

"That's right," I says. "That is why we advocate not only ending the economic power of the capitalists by nationalizing industry and putting it under the control of the workers, but also a completely different government machinery by which the workers can constantly control both industry and all parts of the government including the legislative, executive and judiciary."

"That's what I want to hear about," says Jack. "What kind of a setup can actually keep the government serving the people instead of some clique?"

"A government based on councils of workers, farmers, housewives, professional people and the like," I says. "Take it first on the local level. Now we elect a city council once every so many years on a district basis. In a workers' government the municipal affairs would be run by a council made up of delegates from the unions, housewives and professional organizations. Each delegate would be responsible to the members of his own organization. He would be elected for a very short term, would serve at the same wage or salary as the people he represents, and could be recalled any day of the week by a simple majority vote of his organization."

"To recall him his constituents wouldn't have to prove that he had taken a bribe or committed some other crime. Any time a majority of his organization felt he had voted the wrong way in the council, or that someone else would represent them more vigorously, they could replace him."

"Well," says Jack, "that sounds pretty good to me so far as councilmen are concerned. But how

could you keep your mayor and chief of police and all the city department heads in line? After all, it wouldn't be efficient to change the head of the health department every time somebody's kid caught the measles."

EVERYBODY REPRESENTED

"No, it wouldn't, and you can count on the workers to understand this as well as you and I do. But the important thing is to keep full control over all the departments in the hands of the common people through their complete and constant control over the council. That means that there should be no artificial division between the council and the departments and the courts. City health, direction of traffic, the schools, fire protection, city planning and all the other municipal functions can use technical experts to advise the people and their council on what needs to be done and how best to do it. They can also be in charge of directing the carrying out of the policies laid down by the delegates in the council. As long as they carry out their duties to the satisfaction of the council, OK. But the important thing is that as long as the council has complete control over them, and constant and complete responsibility to the working people organized in unions and other organizations, they won't have much chance to work for some small clique or interest group."

"Maybe you have something there," says Jack. "But why wouldn't it work just as well to have the delegates elected on a ward or district basis as it present, with everything else run like you described it. That way everybody would have a vote. Under our setup there might be a lot of people who wouldn't belong to any organization which has a delegate. Wouldn't they be robbed of their right to vote?"

"Every citizen who does anything useful would have the right to belong to some organization with a delegate," I says. "Because every enterprise would be run not by a capitalist or a board of directors, but by the people who work in it."

"Housewives would band together not just to elect delegates to the city council, but also because the housewives organizations would most likely be in charge of such things as watching over prices, quality and service in the stores, neighborhood child care and recreational facilities and services, and other things about which they know best because they have to contend with them every day. Any citizen who either contributes nothing to the community, or who can't be bothered to look after his own welfare by joining and being active in the organization which controls that welfare would automatically disfranchise himself."

COMMON INTERESTS

"Well, that sounds OK," says Jack, "but I still don't see why you insist on delegates being elected by organizations instead of by wards or districts. Maybe it is just a pet theory of yours."

"It may be a theory," I says, "but everything's a theory till it's been put into practice. Like universal suffrage or atomic fission. The point is this: There are very few things which concern neighbors just because they are neighbors. In one neighborhood you may have an auto worker, a dentist, a longshoreman, a carpenter and a school teacher. Each of them has much more in common with people of their own occupation who may live on the other side of town than they have with each other."

"When the delegates from all the organizations meet, you can be sure that all interests will be represented in proportion to the number of men and women concerned with each. You can be sure, for instance, that the longshoreman will be in a much better position to keep tab on the longshore delegates to the council and to instruct them how to vote than he would be to keep tab on some doctor or carpenter who might come from the ward or district in which he lives."

THE FIRST STEP

"It seems to make sense," says Jack. "I guess one of the reasons the capitalists and the politicians can run things as they please is because they are well organized and have plenty of time and money to maneuver elections. And when we go to vote we usually don't know any more about each candidate or the real issues than what they tell us in their campaign literature."

"That's right," I says to my friend Jack. "The district basis of voting is made to order to give the appearance of democracy while ensuring that the real strings of power remain in the hands of those who control concentrated wealth."

"And the first step toward a workers' government," I says, "is to organize a labor party so that at least all the workers will recognize that they must act according to their class interests politically just as they do economically in their unions. Once such a labor party has taken power in America, we can proceed to reorganize the whole political machinery to serve the interests of the vast majority instead of the few."

WORLD POLITICS

The Unity of Germany:

Last week, the six-power London conference, headed by the Big Three Western states of England, France and America, concluded their lengthy discussions over the formation of "Trizonia," comprising the three western zones of Germany. While the document agreed to has not yet been published (it will be during this week), it is clear that it will be of major importance and will mark a new step not only in the final division of Germany, but the future of Europe itself.

Many of the sharpest and most controversial problems in Europe center around the future of Germany. To a large extent, the fate of the Marshall Plan is bound up with its success or lack of success in reviving the destroyed industries of the Ruhr and other areas of western Germany. Likewise, the strategy of French capitalism is related to what happens in Germany, since France is counting upon a future in which it will become the leading industrial power—the steel master—of the continent.

Although the six-power agreement hasn't been released, and we must therefore wait until next week to learn its details, enough has been revealed to know that it is primarily a document of concessions and compromises with the French over Ruhr control, type of government to be set up in Germany, etc. Yet, despite many concessions, it appears already that a great political crisis will break in France over the issue of this agreement. The reasons for this are many and not the simple explanation of a fear that German militarism will be revived. But an analysis of this must be withheld until the full details of the agreement are known. In preparation for this, it is worth reviewing the background of the German unification question, particularly as related to the current campaign of the German Stalinists whose voices are loudest in the cry for "unity." Accordingly we turn the column over to Comrade Eugene Keller.

Coincident with this conference at London of the Anglo-Americans and the French on the unification of their respective zones, the Stalinist campaign for German "unity" is entering a new stage.

No matter what the attitude of Allied politicians and militarists to the German people, the question of German unity remains a burning issue. To them the prospect of economic rehabilitation, the basis for an independent political existence and freedom from military governments all are bound up with unity. Their future as a people, the perspectives of their youth cannot be separated from the need for the unity of Germany. It is this sentiment which the Russians are exploiting.

The division of Germany into four zones was decided upon by all the Allies at Potsdam. It was also agreed that Germany be treated as an economic unit and that the all-important question of reparations be settled on a nation-wide basis. To this, however, Russia objected, insisting that reparations be extracted on a zonal basis. This made it possible for the Kremlin to loot its zone without controls and to attempt to integrate it with its Eastern "bloc." At the same time, up to the summer of 1946, it consistently opposed the elimination of zonal economic administrations (which were to have been replaced by centralized agencies) as well as any curtailment of its right to determine the nature of economic activity. This attitude could, of course, only deepen the existing partition of Germany.

NOT CONFINED TO CONFERENCE TABLE

As the industrial potential of Eastern Germany declined due to Russian rapacity and due to the fact that, as an integral part of German industry generally, its operation as an independent unit could be very limited, the Russians had to modify their position. At the meeting of the council of Foreign Ministers in June 1946, the Kremlin—which up to that time had strenuously opposed any but the lowest levels of economic activity—proposed upward revision of the level of industries plan and, most important, inter-Allied control over the Ruhr industries. Coupled with these was its demand for \$10 billions in reparations, part of which were to be paid from current production. While Molotov cited the Yalta agreement which he interpreted as authorizing reparations payments from current production, the Anglo-Americans insisted upon a provision of the Potsdam protocol under which "the proceeds of exports

from current production and stock shall be available in the first place for payment for . . . imports." This was not principled opposition to reparations from current production, but gave payments for essential imports precedence over them. This issue has served ever since as a pretext for the Anglo-Americans to prevent any agreement which might advance the extension of Russian influence over the rest of Germany, and, in this sense, the "unity" of Germany has likewise been forestalled by them.

The Russians, however, have not confined their efforts to the conference table, nor have the Anglo-Americans. The latter never, of course, verbally opposed the unity of Germany but their actions have clearly indicated the trend. Byrnes' Stuttgart speech in September 1946, rejecting the Soviet demands of June and the simultaneous merger of the U. S. and British zones were followed by the inclusion of Western Germany into the Marshall Plan—an attempt to tie the Western zones to Western Europe which has a similar economic make-up, furthering the division of Europe without any prospect of a stable economic rehabilitation. The speech of the British zone commander, Gen. Brian Robertson, to the North Rhine-Westphalia parliament on April 7, 1948, calling on the "free" Germans of the West to join the Anglo-Americans (i.e., give up all thought of a united Germany) unambiguously enunciated the latter's policy of keeping Germany divided as long as unity spelled Russian hegemony.

The Russian reply to this policy has made up in denunciations what it could not achieve by disruptive action. The Stalinists in the eastern zone of Germany have been unable to create a solid working class base for themselves, even though the workers are relatively better fed and get more consumers' goods than those of the Western zones. Their Socialist Unity Party, disposing of all the means of propaganda and controlling the police apparatus has seriously lost in influence and prestige. The "Peoples Congress for Unity and a Just Peace," hastily created by the Berlin Communist Party at the time of the last meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers (December 1947) seems to have duped few into taking it for anything but a Stalinist front organization. Faced by the passive opposition and little-concealed contempt of the workers, the Stalinists are now creating the "National Democratic Party" to which former "little Nazis" are to be rallied, and who are expected to contribute the same kind of chauvinism and cringing eagerness to serve their superiors which once made them the mainstay of German fascism.

LEAD TOWARD DEEPENING SPLIT

Over the past two months the Soviet occupation authorities have made a few "concessions," in addition to certain organizational measures (granting more authority to Germans, etc.) to get the necessary popular support behind their drive for "unity." (1) Circulation of petitions demanding a law be passed or a referendum initiated on a "united" and "democratic" Germany. (2) The revision of the Polish-German frontier has been "mentioned." This would possibly return important agricultural areas to Germany. (3) The dissolution of the "de-nazifying commissions" (Feb. 27). The dissolution of these commissions is an attempt to reconcile important segments of the population in the Russian zone. (4) The cessation of property confiscation, ordered April 18. The more worthwhile "properties" have long ago been seized by the Soviet administration, to be sure; yet the proclamation of a special order must be considered as a conciliatory gesture toward the same elements for whose benefits de-nazification has been stopped and a new party is being created. (5) The "demand" initiated by the German Stalinists, for the withdrawal of all Allied troops. This would fool few Germans into believing that the USSR would leave its "interests" unprotected—if only by means of the NKVD—but it would relieve Eastern Germany of a considerable economic burden.

The drive for German "unity" by the Stalinists is one of the few measures by which the Russians can attempt to combat the political effects of the Marshall Plan and by which they exert pressure for a "deal" with the West. It is, however, unlikely to stir the German masses from their present passivity unless the economic stagnation of the Western zones persists despite their merger and Marshall Plan aid.

Neither Stalinism nor American imperialism in the Western half can bring about reunification of the German nation; both can only deepen the present split.

Eugene KELLER

Books You Should Know...

THE VICTIM by Saul Bellow—Vanguard, N. Y., \$2.75. (For Progressive Book Club members, \$2.00) 294 pp.

Saul Bellow's second novel, The Victim, displays the fully developed artistry of style and language promised in his earlier work, Dangling Man. In The Victim, Bellow describes the terrific wrestlings with self, endured by Asa Leventhal, a young Jewish intellectual tormented by a compelling sense of persecution. Set upon by a former acquaintance who has come down in the world and insists Leventhal's actions started him on the road to degenerateness, Asa assures and reassures himself that this is not the case, yet cannot rid himself of the man's accusing presence, pleads for help. Only when his own personal destruction is threatened can Leventhal throw off his persecutor.

A selection of the Progressive Book Club, The Victim is a forceful, expertly written psychological study of a modern man, caught in the complexities of modern society.

M. H.

SCIENCE AND THE MODERN WORLD by Alfred North Whitehead—a Pelican Mentor—212 pp., including index, 35 cents.

One of the best known works of philosopher Whitehead who himself described the book as embodying "a study of some aspects of Western Culture during the past three centuries, in so far as it has been influenced by the development of science."

THEY SHOOT HORSES, DON'T THEY? by Horace McCoy—a Penguin Signet—144 pp., 25 cents.

A novel about a marathon dance set in the depression years. Novelist McCoy, until recently overlooked in this country, has been rediscovered after being hailed in France as one of America's greatest writers.

STRANGE FRUIT by Lillian Smith—a Penguin Signet—182 pp., 25 cents.

A best-seller for the last few years, this novel about race relations in the South will probably add to its record sales in this new edition.

in 1941, and since then the subject of vigorous controversy, evoking either extreme condemnation or praise, it is here made available in an easy to buy, and easy to read edition.

100 AMERICAN POEMS edited by Selden Rodman — A Penguin Signet—184 pp., 25 cents.

This is one of the finest selections of American poetry to be published,

despite its limitation to 100 poems. Editor Rodman has covered the whole range of American poetry from colonial times to the present, and has done so with excellent taste and intelligence.

OFF THE PRESS!

1947 BOUND VOLUMES OF LABOR ACTION \$3.00

A permanent record of week-by-week Marxist analysis of the year's outstanding events. Fifty-two copies of LABOR ACTION, including the EXCELLENT special features contained in the eight-page issues.

Order from WORKERS PARTY PUBLICATIONS 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

**LABOR ACTION**  
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism  
Published Weekly by the  
Labor Action Publishing Co.  
114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.  
General Offices: 4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, N. Y. Tel.: 1Roundsides 6-5117

Vol. 12, No. 24 June 14, 1948  
Emanuel Garrett, Editor  
Editorial Board:  
Hal Draper, Henry Judd  
Business Manager: Paul Bern

Subscription Rates: \$1.00 a Year; 50¢ for 6 Mos.  
\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada, Foreign.

Re-entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

**The BOOK SERVICE**  
Now Has These  
Hard To Get Items:

by Leon Trotsky

TRADE UNIONS IN THE EPOCH OF IMPERIALIST DECAY ..... 25¢  
THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION ..... 10¢  
I STAKE MY LIFE ..... 10¢  
WHITHER FRANCE (Chapter I) ..... 10¢  
THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO TODAY ..... 10¢  
WHAT IS AN INSURRECTION ..... 15¢  
A speech delivered to the Czarist Court in 1906

Six for 60 Cents

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, New York

Name.....  
Address.....  
City..... Zone..... State.....

# Wallace Opposes Lifting Arms Embargo on Israel; His Party Hedges on Stand

(Continued from page 1) speeches have noted a sharp disparity between his prepared written speeches (done by his ghost writers who are Stalinist fellow travelers) and what he says when he simply speaks his mind informally. James Wechsler, one of the few reporters accompanying him on his trip, has noted this frequently.

### NOT ACQUAINTED

In order to ascertain the Wallace Party's opinion, this reporter called their National Headquarters. This reporter was referred to four different departments, including the research department and publicity department. The answer in each case was that they were not acquainted with Wallace's statement, and that they had to look it up. In each case, four times, a promise was made to call back. Not one did so. Several of those questioned stated that what Wallace said was the position as a matter of course. But when the PM quotation was read to them, they stated that it did not sound right, and that it would require research. When the conversation was opened with the question: "What is your position on lifting the embargo," the answer was "We are for lifting the embargo on arms to Palestine."

Not so long ago, Henry Wallace was the chief stumper in a by-election for Leo Isaacson in the Bronx. Many analysts claim that Isaacson's victory was primarily due to his vigorous position on partition and defense of the Jewish State. In checking with the American Labor Party, Stalinist front party in New York which ran Isaacson, they asserted that the ALP was "Vigorously fighting to lift the embargo." They also assured this reporter that Isaacson too is engaged in this same vigorous fight. When questioned on what attitude the ALP took toward Wallace's opposition to lifting the embargo, the publicity director of the ALP said: "I am not familiar with Mr. Wallace's statement." The ALP and Isaacson have certainly not had a word to say about this, good or bad, even though Wallace is for them, their leading national spokesman, and his opposition to lifting the embargo is of some influence in maintaining the embargo.

What does Wallace's position amount to? By opposing the sending of arms to both sides, he does not exactly render himself impartial. In fact, this was precisely the British formula in the UN, which was rightly denounced as actually an anti-Jewish stand, since the Arabs were already well armed by the British, and could normally obtain all they wished for replacement through

their governments in Egypt, Lebanon, etc., whereas the Jews were deliberately disarmed up till May 15. Indeed, carrying and stockpiling of arms was illegal until the day of the British departure, and the opening of the Palestine war. It is inconceivable that Wallace does not know these facts, since they have been carried in all the press. Wallace's position means in effect support to the Arab War.

### CONCERNING INTERFERENCE

Wallace's positive position for withholding ERP to Britain is, if anything, an even more amazing proposal. In regard to the Italian elections, Wallace accused the State Department of influencing Italian politics and policy by purchase, by food, by money. Also, Wallace opposes the Marshall Plan and ERP because he correctly claims that this is imperialism, and that it constitutes interference by Wall Street in the economies and politics of Europe. To threaten to withhold funds unless the British alter their Palestine policy, is direct intimidatory interference. It is crude and open use of American dollars to purchase the foreign policy of Britain. It would constitute a "string" from Washington to London, with Washington the manipulator.

Withholding of ERP is obviously quite as powerful an imperialist weapon as is its granting. Wallace himself has denounced this policy for Russia and Eastern Europe as discriminatory, tending to sharpen the international cleavage, and as actually hindering economic revival in these areas to the detriment of all of Europe. If the policy of withholding under pressure to conform to American desires can be applied to Britain in the Palestine case, it can, of course, be employed in other cases. This policy could be used to bring into line with American desires any policy of any government. For example, the West Germans could be forced to accept a permanent partition of their country under threat of starvation by withholding of American aid as the alternative.

Mr. Wallace reveals himself as no respecter of National sovereignty, and as in fundamental agreement with the imperialist methods of the U. S. He wishes only to change the direction of this imperialism, but not the imperialism itself.

The imperialist policy of Britain must be fought against. But, there is nothing "political" or feasible in supporting American imperialism as against British, or using it as a weapon against the British. The embargo can be lifted by mass pressure in the U. S., and British policy will and can be revised when the workers fight the Labor imperialists. What makes this eminently possible is that there are reports of a rising tide of popular opposition to the government policy. Such a popular attitude could be used to teach the English workers that the Palestine policy is part of the entire imperialist program of Bevin-Attlee. On the other hand, nothing could more effectively solidify these workers with their leaders than the threat of American pressure.

(For the duration of the national election campaign, Jack Brad, whose articles on many subjects are well known to readers of LABOR ACTION, will contribute regularly on the Wallace-Stalinist party. Comrade Brad, formerly Workers Party organizer and candidate in Philadelphia, is now organizer of Local New York of the Workers Party.—Ed.)

## Consistent Opposition To Marshall Plan

Henry Judd's reply last week should, I think, make it clear that the editorial he defends is trying to ride both horses on the Marshall Plan. The Goldman-Farrell position is in my opinion incorrect, but it makes sense. The editorial does not; and Judd only brings its abstruse character into the light.

The emphasis in the editorial SEEMED to be: opposition to the Marshall Plan on PRINCIPLE. Judd furthermore concedes that this position is NOT based on any conditions or strings in the ERP bill itself, but on the necessity of voting No to show lack of confidence in the imperialist government which proposes it as the concretization of American imperialist strategy today. He even says: "The Marshall Plan IS imperialism"—which, I presume, means that whatever objectionable "clauses and conditions" are written into the bill, these objections are secondary and not decisive.

With this, I agree. But this phase of the editorial is only the left-handed pitch. Side by side with it, somehow, the editorial and Judd insist that we are for economic aid to Europe "BY THE PRESENT, CAPITALIST GOVERNMENT." This furthermore is to be viewed as an IMMEDIATE DEMAND, like a housing program.

### ESSENTIAL QUESTION

Now if this present capitalist government proposed, a Housing Plan (let us say, for good capitalist reasons and no matter what the motivations or preambles), we might condemn it as inadequate and demand more; but certainly we would not oppose the Plan on principle! Nor would we declare in advance that we would vote No on it—even if our vote was not decisive! Nor would we mouth phrases like: "This Housing Plan IS capitalism, etc." In fact, if the editorial in question WERE about an "immediate demand," it would be fit only for a curiosity in a political museum.

This touches the essential question. If you would vote No on the ERP bill FOR NO OTHER REASON than the fact that it is the concretization of American imperialist strategy and as a vote of no-confidence in the imperialist government which is going to employ it as such—then how on earth are you ever going to vote FOR any economic-aid bill proposed by this "present, capitalist government"? It can't be done.

Would it be enough to counterpose a bill cleansed of "conditions and strings"? No, these are not the decisive things, you say. Then what would you propose such that you can vote FOR aid by this present, capitalist government? What COULD you propose, if you are for voting No on ERP precisely as a vote of no-confidence in this present capitalist government itself?

To Ben Hall and myself, LABOR ACTION answers: We are for aid by this present imperialist government. And in answer to Goldman the ball shifts to the other hand. But we will vote No on any bill actually proposed for employment by this present imperialist government—no confidence!—even with no conditions or strings written into the bill. One cannot continue to pen schizo answers like this, in alternate "reply" to the pro- and anti-Marshall Plan positions.

Given political opposition to American imperialism's Marshall Plan for the reasons you state in the anti-phase of your seesaw: there is only one possible way to view the question of "economic aid." That is precisely as a "transitional demand" (as we have called certain demands which present an answer to an immediate problem but which are not realizable under this present capitalist government). It was this line which was specifically rejected in the formulation of the editorial, when I proposed it in advance—hence the uneasy seesaw.

### TRANSITIONAL DEMAND

We want to make clear that we have nothing in common with the Stalinists' preference for economic chaos and ruin in Western Europe and their opposition (admitted or not) to economic aid as such. We are for economic aid—but not for an economic-aid program which is the main arm of American imperialism's drive to buy up Europe.

To this we counterpose ECONOMIC AID TO EUROPE UNDER WORKERS' CONTROL, not under the control of this present capitalist government. As Marxists we fully recognize that a fight for this is part and parcel of the fight for a workers' government—that is why it is a "transitional demand." But that is the only economic-aid program on which we can vote Yes without going along with "the American imperialist strategy in our day." This essential idea, here concisely expressed, would require expansion and elaboration, of course, but it is the political heart of the question I am concerned with in this restricted space.

To this Judd replies that "it would shunt aside to another planet" the need for economic aid to Europe. (He thus says a bit too much in his new-found discovery that your position is "much closer to that of Goldman"

than it is to Hall's and mine.) We used to hear that planetary sneer when, during the late imperialist war, we insisted that we were FOR fighting Hitlerism, but against supporting this "war against fascism." How then did we propose to fight Hitlerism concretely (that is, with armed force)? Under a workers' government, we said (in political essence); meanwhile the main enemy was at home. Then came the reference to planets, by people who wished to represent the imperialist war as primarily (for them) a "war against fascism"—just as supporters of the Marshall Plan today claim that its decisive (for them) political meaning is European economic reconstruction, rather than the main gun in the cold phase of World War III.

But—as the editorialists and Judd know in their left phase—the fight for a workers' government is not taking place on another planet; it happens to be the reason for existence of the Workers Party and LABOR ACTION. Our position on the Marshall Plan (that is, on American imperialism), must be indissolubly connected with it.

Hal DRAPER

## Issues Involved In the Discussion

The discussion on the Marshall Plan as it appears in LABOR ACTION has produced some curious views. Apparently Comrade Goldman has set the tone to this discussion and also its limits. He regards the Marshall Plan as a "huge relief project which seeks to succor the European masses. In his rejoinder to the editorial which appeared in LA, he grants out of hand that the government has other motives, but that it is secondary since the project is "a concrete plan for aid to Europe." If that is its main feature, how can a socialist oppose a concrete plan for aid to Europe because he does not approve of the motives of those who propose the plan?

Having forced the discussion on this plane, Goldman compelled the authors of the LABOR ACTION editorial to squeeze themselves dry to prove that we socialists are for relief and would tell the European workers not to reject such relief even if it came from U.S. imperialism.

Thereupon, Goldman creates a hypothetical situation in which a hypothetical socialist congressman is faced with a tie vote in Congress on the question of aid to Europe. Could such a congressman then vote against a plan, whose "motives" are bad, but which provides relief for the masses? The editorial's answer is somewhat ambiguous since it states that we are opposed to the Plan and yet gives no clear-cut formulation for this opposition or how this hypothetical congressman would vote in this hypothetical situation (a really concrete, practical and realistic phase of the discussion!).

In any case, the editorial at least tries to understand what the Marshall Plan is. Farrell understands it, too, but he has made a choice and his choice is clear: in the struggle against Stalinism he is ready to support western imperialism against the Stalinist variety. He has some misgivings about it, to be sure, since he wishes there was some way in which the problem of aid could be controlled by the working class. But, since that is out of question now, he is willing to settle for bourgeois control and bourgeois policy as the lesser evil in the world situation.

### NOT A RELIEF PROJECT

But Goldman does not even have that kind of inverted logic in his favor. As a matter of fact, despite his protests that he does understand the nature of the Marshall Plan, that is exactly what has to be discussed with Goldman. For if he does understand the nature of the Marshall Plan and still persists in his views, he really shuts his eyes to what is important and opens them to what is not, and adopts an extremely dangerous position.

The Marshall Plan is not a huge relief project for the purpose of supplying food, shelter and clothing to the European masses. This aspect of its relief aims are secondary, subordinate and incidental to its main purpose of stabilizing the industrial potential of western Europe in preparation for the next war. But that is not all.

1. The Marshall Plan is the concretization of the "Truman Doctrine." Its main relief aims are concerned with the revival of the economies of America's potential allies for war. The Plan is the latter-day method employed by the U.S. to put Europe on economic rations, to subordinate its economy and to aid in strengthening this nation's position in that part of the world.

All else is subsumed under this basic orientation. The economic and political policies of the current administration, and those of its successor, will travel a road determined in advance by the above aims. It is an extreme form of political myopia which thinks, first, that the Marshall Plan is important only for the relief it offers the European masses, and second, that there are "no strings attached" to the plan. Goldman's discussion of "strings" is really facetious.

LABOR ACTION invites its readers to contribute discussion articles on the Marshall Plan: Contributions must be limited to 1000 words!

2. The aid contemplated by the Plan, which is directed primarily to industry, and through private capitalist channels for the most part, is accompanied by political blackmail. Humanitarianism has nothing whatever to do with the "motives" (read: aims) of the plan. Otherwise, aid would be given freely and universally.

A plan which seeks the subordination of the economy of a large part of the industrial world to the United States has an endless number of strings emanating from it. Otherwise no one could explain much of the conflict in the ruling stratum of American society around such questions as the desirability of reconstructing potential industrial rivals, which industries to revive, how much capital to advance, what cartelization shall be permitted, or what nationalizations to countenance.

3. On the specific question of the control of the European currencies, Goldman's answer is unscrupulous and really a non sequitur. He writes: "Let me assure you that socialism can come into existence in spite of the fact that the European currencies might be tied to the American dollar." Whether socialism can come "in spite of" this, has nothing whatever to do with the question. Socialism can come in spite of many things, including imperialism, crises, fascism and Stalinism. The point under discussion, however, is whether or not there are strings attached to the plan. In his first letter, Goldman wrote that he did not know of any strings attached. In that too, he was unique, since he is probably the only person in the country who did not know that. Again, American control of the European currencies is of inestimable importance. For behind this rather prosaic fact lies another prosaic fact: American control of the economy of the Plan nations. But behind these prosaic facts are the living ones: the U.S. must intervene in the everyday economic, political and social life of western Europe, and the class relations therein. It will thus affect the day to day life of every man, woman and child in those countries. Already, Paul G. Hoffman, gauleiter of the Plan, warns the British-Labor Party government not to nationalize the steel industry or suffer the loss of assistance.

4. But the real "string attached" is that only those countries which agree to come into a western European-U.S. economic, political and military bloc will receive American assistance. Is that a condition, a string, or whatever other adjective you want to use, attached to the plan? The answer is obvious. And all of this has consequences, for imperialism and for socialism alike. Suppose a nation does not agree to come into this bloc? No aid! Suppose it does? Then it has to accept certain U.S. premises.

5. The planned policing of food and clothing relief is another aspect of political blackmail. Some congressmen may be concerned that there be no waste and no black marketing in such goods. But primarily the policing is for the purpose of guaranteeing that these materials serve American aims and do not find their way into "communist hands."

One can have doubts about "strings attached" only if one conceives of the Marshall Plan primarily as a relief project, or a humanitarian enterprise. One can have no doubts whatever about it if one views the Marshall Plan for what it really is, the expression of American post-war imperialist policy, the outgrowth of the failure of the U.S.-Russian alliance to survive the first days of peace.

### OPPOSING IMPERIALISM

Given these considerations, our policy is indicated. As socialist internationalists, as opponents of both imperialist camps, we cannot and must not give support in any form to either of the imperialist power blocs. More than ever it is required that we carry the independent banner of world socialism. The forces of confusion and disorientation are great indeed and they require no assistance from us. We remain alone against a world of savage opponents, a world sharply divided between active and passive supporters of capitalist imperialism and Stalinist imperialism. Even sections of the Fourth Internationalist movement, most notably the Cannonite Socialist Workers Party, play the role of left-handed supporters of Stalinist imperialism.

Under such world conditions our obligations are clear. If we had a congressman his task too would be clear. He would use that parliamentary tribunal to speak out the truth! Not only about Stalinist imperialism, but American imperialism as well. He would say what the Marshall Plan is, and not confuse the issue with some unclear statements about relief. A socialist congressman would present his own program and his own plan. For we are never against anything per se. We are against the Marshall Plan, but we are for this or that socialist plan.

But obviously, given Goldman's hypothetical situation, our lone socialist congressman would get only his own vote for his plan. And assume that there was a tie vote, would our lone socialist in Congress sit by and permit no relief for the European people? Obviously not, if he could do anything about it. Without supporting the Marshall Plan and voting against it, he would move an amendment on relief alone. Would that solve anything? Maybe not. But in that way we would take no responsibility for the acts of an imperialist government.

Yes, we demand of a capitalist government that it grant relief. It has happened before, it may happen again. Capitalist governments have been known to send relief, and may perhaps do so again. But we can never subordinate our class politics, our socialist politics, our internationalist positions to such a question. We can never lose sight of our internationalist socialist program in fighting for such a partial demand. We can never conduct ourselves in such a manner that we become identified with the bourgeoisie and its political programs.

In this particular case, it is impossible for socialists to vote for or support the Marshall Plan because, attached to it, subordinated and incidental to it, a measure of relief is granted as a vehicle for enforcing and realizing the broader aims of American imperialist policy in Europe.

It is interesting to observe the great tumult about relief now, in the discussion of the Marshall Plan. Why were there no vigorous interventions by Goldman and Farrell and others during the many months of governmental debate on UNRRA, which was more nearly a pure relief proposition and when its abolition created an interim period of no relief whatever to Europe? Were not the European masses in want then? Yes, even more so than in some countries today, for in several of the countries, the industrial production indices indicate a higher level than before the war. Obviously, it is not the "relief" question which beats so strongly, but the Stalinist seizure of power in Czechoslovakia which has produced the present intense interest in the Marshall Plan. But the interests, consciously or not, have a political meaning, not a humanitarian one.

That is the plane on which the discussion should be held and not on whether socialists are, or should be, in favor of relief when given by a capitalist government. We never opposed it when the Roosevelt government gave it during the Thirties and now. We complained that it was insufficient. But that is not the same thing as voting for or endorsing imperialist policy under the guise of supporting relief measures.

Albert GATES.

It has been a traditional policy of the Marxist movement that in the realm of foreign policy, as distinct from domestic policy, we have never advanced immediate or transitional proposals. In this sphere we have confined ourselves to an uncompromising demand to end imperialism and all its works, an aim that could only be realized by a workers' government. Hall's contention that imperialism cannot be reformed is essentially correct. There is no basis for changing this view. However, in the past our attitude toward the foreign policy of American imperialism was 100 per cent "anti" every one of its proposals. We followed a completely negative and obstructionist tactic. The concept that "the worse for American imperialism, the better for world socialism" is true only when an independent proletarian movement or a colonial people is in a position to profit. If, as is the case in many key questions today, it is only Stalinism that can profit, we must weigh our tactics in the light of this fact.

## World Situation And Marxist Policy

The great merit of our Workers Party is that it recognized that the political world of 1923-1939, which gave birth to the Trotskyist movement, died during the course of World War II. Unfortunately, we have not always realized how much of the old Trotskyist program has been outlived as a result. Our thinking, consequently, has a tendency to proceed on two levels, that of convention resolutions, where we bring our views abreast of the times, and that of every day reactions to new events, where we instinctively follow old, deep-worn grooves which, often, have no relation to the real world of today. I fear that the reaction of Comrades Draper and Hall to the Marshall Plan suffers from this defect.

Fundamental to the politics of the Workers Party has been our view that we live in a three-power world—(1) the capitalist world, mainly American imperialism, (2) the bureaucratic collectivist world, mainly the Russian imperialist sphere, and (3) the proletariat. The latter, however, we have recognized as a power in a different sense than the other two. While capitalism and Stalinism are real powers, the proletariat, today, is only a potential power. Catastrophic defeats, at the hands of Stalinism and fascism, have reduced the army of the proletariat from its status of 1917-23, when it was a real power that contended with capitalism for the mastery of the world, to disoriented, divided and largely demoralized battalions that are physically and ideologically captives in either the camp of Stalinism or the camp of capitalism. The proletariat is far less a subjective force in the world today than an objective factor, taken into account by the two forces that dominate the struggle.

### THE THIRD CAMP

The central strategic aim of our epoch is to reestablish the proletariat as a real power, able to attack, independently, both Stalinism and capitalism and best them in the struggle for world domination. This is the Third Camp and the meaning of the slogan of "Neither Washington nor Moscow." We must never forget, however, that the Third Camp is an AIM, not a present reality. If we delude ourselves into thinking that the Third Camp exists as a real power, in the sense of the revolutionary battalions

led by the Comintern in its early years, the slogan "Neither Washington nor Moscow" will become a sectarian trap that effectively seals us off from contact with the real struggle.

It goes without saying that mere propaganda will never suffice to translate our aim into achievement. We can effect the liberation of the proletariat from the camps of capitalism and Stalinism and place it on the road of independent class action only through participation in the existing political struggle in order to advance at each stage those proposals which will facilitate the process. But the existing political struggle is primarily the struggle between the Stalinist and capitalist camps. It is they who determine the shape and form of this struggle (witness the Mikolajczyk movement in Poland and the Stalinist strike wave in France.) If we seek only the kind of political struggle we would initiate, we will never enter the arena. It is relatively simple to establish the Stalinist or capitalist motivation behind this or that action initiated by one or the other enemy camp. But it is utterly futile to consider our duty done with such an exposé. Participation in political life, today, requires that we seize upon every issue that affords us the opportunity to steer toward our aim, whatever may have been the aims sought by the imperialist camp which initiate the issue.

The struggle between capitalism and Stalinism is a struggle between two social orders, each seeking to remake the world in its own image. Marxist principles that have served as a sound guide in struggles between blocs of capitalist powers for world domination cannot always apply in this situation. The effect of our policies upon the struggle between capitalism and Stalinism is not irrelevant to us. We cannot any longer simply say that the main enemy is at home and direct unilateral demands to one side. The absence of a demand in our press for the withdrawal of American troops from Germany without regard to what the Russians do is, of course, no oversight. As long as Stalinism, rather than an independent proletariat, would fill the vacuum, such a unilateral withdrawal would be a setback to our aims, not an advance.

### FOREIGN POLICY

There has been a traditional policy of the Marxist movement that in the realm of foreign policy, as distinct from domestic policy, we have never advanced immediate or transitional proposals. In this sphere we have confined ourselves to an uncompromising demand to end imperialism and all its works, an aim that could only be realized by a workers' government. Hall's contention that imperialism cannot be reformed is essentially correct. There is no basis for changing this view. However, in the past our attitude toward the foreign policy of American imperialism was 100 per cent "anti" every one of its proposals. We followed a completely negative and obstructionist tactic. The concept that "the worse for American imperialism, the better for world socialism" is true only when an independent proletarian movement or a colonial people is in a position to profit. If, as is the case in many key questions today, it is only Stalinism that can profit, we must weigh our tactics in the light of this fact.

The Marshall Plan is the current form of American foreign policy for Europe, much like the Monroe Doctrine for Latin America and the Open Door for China. It is NOT our policy and we can never assume responsibility for it. The ERP establishes the means of achieving the first aim of the Marshall policy, the economic reconstruction of Western Europe as a bulwark against Russia. Our aims also demand the economic reconstruction of Europe. As is almost unavoidable in a three-cornered fight, the aims of two contenders momentarily coincide. We are clear as to the motivations of American imperialism in this matter—they are imperialist. But American imperialism is not the main danger in Western Europe today. The main danger is economic chaos and Stalinism. We need a breathing space in Europe to reassemble the proletarian forces to liberate Europe from both American imperialism and Stalinism. Should we, by a doctrinaire clinging to outlived formulae, take an obstructionist attitude toward ERP, which, to the extent we had power, to block it, can only benefit Stalinism and harm the chances of a proletarian socialist revival in Europe? The new world situation demands that we wear and tack in such a manner as to draw the maximum benefits from ERP for OUR aims, without taking responsibility for something which is beyond our control and administered by one enemy camp in its struggle against the other enemy camp. If, in that hypothetical situation, adduced by our critics, viz., that we had a vote in Congress, we would use it to declare "no confidence" in the imperialist regime that sponsors the ERP, unless, in the even more hypothetical situation which has been posed, viz., that our vote was decisive, we may either abstain or vote for it with a clarifying statement. How we would vote in a parliamentary body on this question is, of course, a tenth rate question, entirely subject to tactical considerations. Ernest ERBER

## GATES TO LECTURE ON STALINISM IN LOS ANGELES

LOS ANGELES — Albert Gates, organizer of the Workers Party, will give three lectures on "The Meaning of Stalinism," beginning June 11. The lectures will take place on Friday nights at the Park Manor, 607 S. Western, Los Angeles, and are as follows:

- June 11—The Origins of Stalinism.
- June 18—Evolution of Stalinism as a New Society.
- June 25—Stalinism: the New World Slavery.

## Articles in LABOR ACTION THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Read, discussed, argued about in radical and labor circles of all shades. Also in the capitalist press. Quoted and reprinted in labor papers in this country and in the labor and socialist press throughout the world.

Here are a few recent samples:

- New York Herald Tribune, Sunday May 23: "I have to thank the publishers of 'The New Internationalist,' a monthly organ of the Trotskyist Workers Party, for sending me a copy of the March issue, in which Mr. Ernest Erber gives the most thorough and enlightening analysis of the methods by which the Stalinists worked up to their coup in Czechoslovakia which I have seen anywhere. Any reader who has any faith left in the sincerity of their commiseration with minorities in this country should read this. . . ." From "Feathers From the Left Wing" by Rodney Gilbert.
- The Socialist Leader, official organ of the Independent Labour Party (Great Britain) of April 24 reprinted the profile of General MacArthur by Jack Brad which appeared in the March 29 issue of LABOR ACTION.
- Sannasamaist, paper of the Ceylon Lanka Sama Samaja, of April, 1948 reprinted an article from LABOR ACTION by Stanley Grey entitled "Nationalization of Industry—Is It the Same As Socialism?"
- The Southern Advocate for Workers' Councils, an international digest, published in Melbourne, Australia, of April, 1948, prints a digest of a very interesting article by Jack Ranger called "Collapse or Prosperity?" (LABOR ACTION, January 8 and 15, 1948). They also have this to say, "Among our many exchanges is LABOR ACTION, weekly paper of the Workers Party of U.S.A. This group was formed some years ago as a result of a split in the ranks of the American Trotskyists. It has since developed many interesting differences, and though still claiming to be Trotskyist is far removed from the official 'Fourth International'."
- "LABOR ACTION and the monthly organ of the party, New Internationalist, are among the very few papers on the left which manage to get away from the trite expressions of vulgarized Marxism which pass for analysis these days."
- CARLO's cartoons are regularly and constantly reprinted. They appear weekly in LABOR ACTION.

Don't Miss a Single Copy of LABOR ACTION (\$1.00 per year) Or THE NEW INTERNATIONAL (\$2.00 per year) SUBSCRIBE! Send in your own name. Send in the names of your friends. Subscribe for a library or one of our friends overseas. Combination Subscriptions \$2.50 per year. 4th Floor, 4 COURT SQUARE, LONG ISLAND CITY 1, N. Y.